

REMARKS

In order to be responsive to the election or restriction requirement set forth in the Office Action, applicant hereby elects the claims of invention I, that is, claims 1-33 and 125-129, with traverse, for the following reasons: The key aspects of claims 34-124 though different in scope, are similar to the key aspects of claims 1-33 and 125-129. Applicant respectfully submits that claims 1-129, though different in scope, are nonetheless sufficiently similar to merit examination in the same application, as they share dominant elements. Examination of all claims 1-129 in the same application would not pose a serious burden under M.P.E.P. § 803 because there is commonality of dominant elements between the claims of Groups I-VI. In a balance of the equities, the burden and cost to applicant of prosecuting separate applications to inventions having common dominant elements appears to outweigh the burden on the Examiner to search and examine the present application as a unitary invention. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the election or restriction requirement be withdrawn.

In view of the foregoing, applicant believes that claims 1-129 are all allowable and the same is respectfully requested. If any impediment to the allowance of these claims remains after entry of this Response, and such impediment could be alleviated during a telephone interview, the Examiner is invited to initiate the same.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fee or to credit any overpayment in connection with this Response to Deposit Account No. 50-0836.

DATED this 8 day of April, 2004.

Respectfully submitted,



Karl R. Cannon
Attorney Registration No. 36,468
Attorney for Applicant

Clayton, Howarth & Cannon, P.C.
P.O. Box 1909
Sandy, UT 84091
Telephone: (801) 255-5335
Facsimile: (801) 255-5338

KRC/CBV

S:\CHC Files\T 9--\T93--\T9320\B\response a.wpd